Journal of Hellenic Studies 130 (2010) 153–163 DOI: 10.1017/S0075426910000753

THUCYDIDES 2.35 AND 45.2: AGAINST PRAISE

R.I. WINTON
*University of Nottingham**

Abstract: This paper suggests that two much-discussed passages in Pericles' Funeral Speech in Thucydides Book 2, the first in 2.35.2, the second in 2.45.2, are more closely related than has previously been recognized: both express a negative view of praise – praise of the fallen; and of their widows. It proposes new interpretations of the passages in question: in the first sentence of 35.2 Pericles is contrasting the splendour of the funeral *ceremony* with the necessary restraint of a funeral *speech* (which Pericles does *not* in this chapter imply was a later addition to the former); in the second sentence of 45.2 he seeks to hearten the widows of the fallen by reminding them, first, that marriage has brought them fulfilment as women and, secondly, that they, as *Athenian* women, can be relied upon to conduct themselves fittingly – in implicit contrast to the most celebrated, and notorious, of Greek women: Helen.

Pericles begins his Funeral Speech in Thucydides Book 2 by dissenting from the view that the speech is a laudable feature of the funeral ceremony: in his opinion, such a speech is in fact more likely to diminish than to enhance the glory of those it is meant to honour (35.1–2).[1] He ends his speech with the assertion, which itself concludes a *parainesis* addressed to the widows of those being buried, that great *doxa* is hers who has least *kleos* among the opposite sex (45.2).[2] These two paradoxes may, I think, point to a closer connection between the passages in question than has been recognized.

What Pericles is saying in the opening chapter of the Funeral Speech is in broad terms quite clear: while most of his predecessors have expressed approval of the fact that the ceremony includes a *logos*, he has reservations, which he sets out in some detail (35.1–2); however, he must bow to the *nomos*, and do his best (35.3). There are, nonetheless, a number of points in this chapter that require consideration.

First, let us note that Pericles' opening contrast between his predecessors' view and his own is, as Fraenkel pointed out,[3] formulaic. Pericles begins, 'Most of those who have spoken here me… But I…' (35.1); compare, for example, the opening of Archidamus' speech in Book 1, 'At my age, Lacedaemonians, I have had experience of many wars… Any one who calmly reflects will find that the war about which you are now deliberating...' (1.80.1) and that of Cleon's speech in the Mytilene Debate, 'I have remarked again and again that a democracy cannot manage an empire, but never more than now…' (3.37.1). The opening of the Funeral Speech features the contrast between many and one at two levels: Pericles questions the praise that most of his predecessors have bestowed on the individual responsible for the funeral *logos* – a *logos* which, as he goes on to observe, involves one individual praising many for their *erga*.[4]

The second point is a good deal less straightforward. Speakers at previous ceremonies, Pericles says in his opening sentence (35.1), have praised the lawgiver who added this oration to the *nomos* (τὸν προσθέντα τῶι νόμωι τὸν λόγον τόνδε); 'it seemed to them a worthy thing

* richard.winton@nottingham.ac.uk.

[1] I refer to the Funeral Speech by chapter and section alone. Other references without author are also to Thucydides; references to commentaries are by author's name alone, the reference being, unless otherwise indicated, to the commentary on the passage in question. Quotations from Thucydides in the original are from the *OCT*, adapted; translated passages are for the most part taken from Jowett's translation.

[2] This assertion ends the main part of the speech; Chapter 46 is, as its opening words make clear, an epilogue.

[3] Fraenkel (1961) 1.

[4] The *logos*/*ergon* antithesis thus introduced is, as commentators have noted, a *leitmotif* of the speech as a whole; *cf.* Parry (1981) 159–71.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426910000753 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that such an honour should be given at their burial to the dead who have fallen on the field of battle'. The words τὸν προσθέντα τῶι νόμωι τὸν λόγον τόνδε are generally taken to speak of the *logos* as having not been part of the funeral ceremony as originally instituted: the *logos* was a later addition to the ceremony in its original form. If this is what Pericles is saying, it comes very much as a surprise: nothing in the detailed account of the ceremony that Thucydides has given in the preceding chapter has suggested that this was the case. On the contrary, Thucydides' account of what at the outset he terms the Athenians' *patrios nomos* (34.1) presents the *logos* as the culmination of the ceremony as a whole, without any hint of its being of more recent origin than the other elements of the ceremony.[5] Furthermore, if this is what Pericles is saying in his opening sentence, there is, it seems to me, some tension between this sentence and what he goes on to say in the rest of this chapter.

Consider first its final sentence: 'However, since our ancestors (τοῖς πάλαι) have set the seal of their approval upon the practice, I must obey…' (35.3). Pericles, in recognizing an obligation to deliver the speech that the *nomos* requires, notwithstanding the doubts he has expressed in 35.2,[6] is apparently deferring to ancestral authority (it is hard to see who 'our ancestors' are if they are not those who endorsed the proposal that there should be a *logos*); this seems odd if he believes that the *logos* was not part of the ceremony as originally instituted, but a subsequent addition – in that case, would not the argument from antiquity tell against the *logos* rather than for it?[7]

Consider, secondly, the sentence that follows Pericles' opening sentence: ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρκοῦν ἂν ἐδόκει εἶναι ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργωι γενομένων ἔργωι καὶ δηλοῦσθαι τὰς τιμάς, οἷα καὶ νῦν περὶ τὸν τάφον τόνδε δημοσίαι παρασκευασθέντα ὁρᾶτε, καὶ μὴ ἐν ἑνὶ ἀνδρὶ πολλῶν ἀρετὰς κινδυνεύεσθαι εὖ τε καὶ χεῖρον εἰπόντι πιστευθῆναι (35.1). At this stage only one point in this sentence requires attention: is ἂν near the beginning to be taken with ἐδόκει or with εἶναι? If the former,[8] this 'would imply "I should have thought under certain conditions, which conditions not existing I do not think"';[9] but what Pericles goes on to say in 35.2 suggests[10] that the proposition in question in fact represents his current view: if, as we have seen, at the end of the chapter Pericles accepts that he must deliver a speech, this, it seems, is because he recognizes an obligation to do so rather than because his personal view of the matter has changed. The alternative construal, of ἂν with εἶναι, faces the objection that ἐδόκει is imperfect, not present;[11] this however may be seen as tact on Pericles' part: 'Pericles …, while complying with the usage of former men, does not change his own opinions, though he modestly says "it *was* my notion" in preference to saying "it is my notion"'.[12] The point then is that Pericles is saying: 'It seemed to me that the ceremony would be adequate without a *logos*'; if he has just remarked that the *logos* had not formed part of the ceremony as originally instituted, one might have expected him to express the view that the ceremony *had been* adequate without one.

[5] The adjective *patrios* indicates that the *nomos* was a well-established one; it does not imply or suggest great antiquity (though it does not of course exclude this). *Cf.*, for example, Ostwald (1969) 175; *contra* Gomme, who takes it to mean that the *nomos* is 'one dating from at least as early as Solon'. Thucydides' account of the *nomos*, which is concerned with the procedure, not with how this came into being, implies that the *nomos* is earlier than Marathon (34.5: the exception that proves the rule about burial in the *demosion sema*), but is not earlier than Cleisthenes' reforms (34.3: there was a *larnax* for the dead of each tribe; *cf.* Clairmont (1983) 12). We do not I think need to engage here with the 'notoriously controversial' question of at what date the *nomos* did as a matter of fact come into existence (the phrase is Parker's ((1996) 132)).

[6] Whatever the precise meaning of the first sentence in 35.2, a question to be discussed below.

[7] *Cf.*, for example, the term *epitheta* in Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 25.2, with Rhodes.

[8] The view assumed by recent commentators.

[9] Shilleto.

[10] Again, whatever the precise meaning of its first sentence; see below.

[11] *Cf.*, for example, Poppo.

[12] Shilleto. Others who take ἂν with εἶναι include Haack and Goeller.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426910000753 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It thus seems worthwhile to consider whether an alternative understanding of the words τὸν προσθέντα τῶι νόμωι τὸν λόγον τόνδε in Pericles' opening sentence may be available. A prior question presents itself, however: is the standard understanding of Pericles' words supported by other evidence?

No such evidence, we may note, is to be found in the other funeral speeches that we have;[13] on the other hand, two post-Classical authors explicitly state that the *logos* was not part of the funeral ceremony in its original form.

At 11.33.2, Diodorus reports that after the battle of Plataea the victorious Greeks dedicated a gold tripod at Delphi and set up inscriptions at Thermopylae; he continues:

> In like manner the citizen-body of the Athenians embellished the tombs of those who had perished in the Persian War, held the Funeral Games then for the first time and passed a law that laudatory addresses upon men who were buried at the public expense should be delivered by speakers selected for each occasion (11.33.3; tr. Oldfather).

At *Roman Antiquities* 5.17.3, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, having reported that Valerius delivered the funeral speech in honour of Brutus, remarks that he does not know whether this was the first such speech among the Romans, or whether Valerius was following a *nomos* that had existed under the kings; what he does know is that such speeches were a Roman invention, not a Greek one – as is made clear by all the most authoritative sources. He continues (5.17.4):

> For although these writers have given accounts of funeral games, both gymnastic and equestrian, held in honour of famous men by their friends, as by Achilles for Patroclus and, before that, by Heracles for Pelops, yet none of them makes any mention of eulogies spoken over the deceased except the tragic poets at Athens, who, out of flattery to their city, invented this legend also in the case of those who were buried by Theseus. For it was only at some late period that the Athenians added to their custom the funeral oration (προσέθεσαν τὸν ἐπιτάφιον ἔπαινον τῶι νόμωι), having instituted it either in honour of those who died in defence of their country at Artemisium, Salamis and Plataea, or on account of the deeds performed at Marathon (tr. Cary, adapted).

And even Marathon, Dionysius goes on to observe, was later than Brutus' funeral, if indeed that was the occasion of the first funeral speech at Rome.

Neither author cites precise authority for his assertion about the Athenians' adding a speech to their ceremony.[14] Dionysius' wording resembles Pericles' (προσέθεσαν ... τῶι νόμωι ~ τὸν προσθέντα τῶι νόμωι); both statements, I suggest, may ultimately derive from what I want now to propose is in fact a misunderstanding of what Pericles is saying in 35.1.

At 2.136.2, Herodotus records that economic difficulties in Egypt under Asychis led to the introduction of a law permitting borrowing on the security of the corpse of the borrower's father; he continues: προστεθῆναι δὲ ἔτι τούτωι τῶι νόμωι that control of the family tomb rested with the lender until the debt was repaid. Herodotus seems here to be reporting two provisions of a single *nomos*, rather than two different *nomoi*:[15] on this view, προστεθῆναι denotes the adding of a further clause to the *nomos* while still in draft.

At *Republic* 468a, Socrates having raised the question of how the soldiers of their ideal city should conduct themselves while on campaign, Glaucon invites him to state his views. Dealing quickly with cowardice in the face of the enemy and being taken prisoner, Socrates moves on (468b) to consider how meritorious conduct is to be rewarded. Glaucon readily agrees that a

[13] Gorg. DK 80 B 5–6; Lys. 2; Pl. *Menex.* 236d4–249c8; Dem. 60; Hyp. 6.

[14] It is to be noted that Diodorus and Dionysius disagree on the antiquity of the *epitaphios agon.*

[15] So How and Wells; contrast, for example, de Sélincourt's Penguin translation: 'with the further provision, added later'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426910000753 Published online by Cambridge University Press

soldier who distinguishes himself in the field is to be crowned by the accompanying youths and children, and, further, to receive a handshake from them; but Socrates expects him to demur at the idea that he should kiss and be kissed by each of them. On the contrary: not only does Glaucon welcome the proposal; he continues: καὶ προστίθημι γε τῶι νόμωι that for the duration of the campaign no rebuff should be permitted (468b12–c4). Here there can be no question but that προστίθημι denotes the adding of a clause to a *nomos* in process of formulation.[16]

Finally, at Demosthenes 23.50 the speaker, as further proof that the law sensibly distinguishes between justified and unjustified conduct, quotes the law on slander, which qualifies its prohibition of speaking ill of another: 'τὰ ψευδῆ' προσέθηκεν – it is only false speaking that the law prohibits. Here it is a matter of a phrase being added, evidently during the drafting of the law, for the avoidance of doubt as to what conduct was therein prohibited.

Similarly, I suggest, in our passage: the words τὸν προσθέντα τῶι νόμωι τὸν λόγον τόνδε refer not to the reform of an existing *nomos* but to the original framing of the *nomos*,[17] the *logos* being an 'addition' in two respects: first, as Thucydides has just made clear (34.6), it follows the committal and brings proceedings to a close; secondly, it is not an indispensable element of the ceremony, but rather one intended to enhance it.

Pericles opens his speech with others' praise of the funeral speech – *logos* about *logos*: it is *kalon* that a speech be delivered over those being buried. In their view, that is to say, *logos* matches *ergon.* Pericles sees the matter differently: for him, the *ergon* of the burial is matched rather with the *ergon* of military prowess, the high honours thus paid to the deceased δημοσίαι being adequate in themselves. What is more, a *logos* is not only *de trop*, upsetting the balance between *ergon* and *ergon*, it in fact puts in jeopardy what it aims to extol: καὶ μὴ ἐν ἑνὶ ἀνδρὶ πολλῶν ἀρετὰς κινδυνεύεσθαι εὖ τε καὶ χεῖρον εἰπόντι πιστευθῆναι (35.1). Pericles' point here is generally taken to be that the credibility of the achievements of the deceased[18] depends upon whether or not the speaker acquits himself well. Whatever his point, it is explained or justified by the sentence that follows: χαλεπὸν γὰρ τὸ μετρίως εἰπεῖν ἐν ὧι μόλις καὶ ἡ δόκησις τῆς ἀληθείας βεβαιοῦται (35.2). This sentence has generated much discussion. In the light of what Pericles goes on to say in his next two sentences,[19] the most natural way to take its main clause is as saying that it is difficult to strike a balance between being charged on the one hand with not doing justice to the dead, and on the other with exaggerating their merits; but what is the antecedent of the relative ὧι, and what point is being made by the relative clause as a whole?[20]

I suggest that in the phrase εὖ τε καὶ χεῖρον εἰπόντι in the preceding sentence Pericles is saying that a speaker jeopardizes the esteem in which the dead are held whether he speaks well or badly – even a good speech risks doing damage to it:[21] a paradox he at once goes on to elucidate. To succeed, the speaker must achieve a mean between the expectations of some in his audience and the envious scepticism of others, and this is no easy task: thus far the main clause,

[16] I should note that both this instance and the one in Herodotus quoted above are cited by LSJ *s.v.* A.III, in connection with our passage.

[17] It is worth noting that this seems to be how the scholiast understood the phrase: οἱ μὲν πολλοί, φησί, τῶν ἐνθάδε ἤδη εἰρηκότων ἐπαινοῦσι τὸν νομοθέτην τόν προσθέντα ἐν τῶι αὐτοῦ νόμωι τὸν λόγον τὸν κελεύοντα λέγεσθαι τὸν ἐπιτάφιον ἐπὶ τοῖς θαπτομένοις δημοσίαι. (The majority, he says, of those who have spoken here before praise the lawgiver who added to his law the clause requiring the funeral address to be delivered over those being buried at public expense.)

[18] With most commentators I take the infinitive πιστευθῆναι to be epexegetic: *cf.* Maurer (1995) 128–29.

[19] Quoted in full below.

[20] *Cf.* especially Poppo; Jowett; and note, for example, the differing translations of Rhodes ('It is hard to speak appropriately in circumstances where even the appearance of truth can only with difficulty be confirmed') and Hornblower ('For it is difficult to avoid saying either too little or too much, in an area where nobody's grasp of the truth is sure').

[21] So Maurer (1995) 129, n.46.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426910000753 Published online by Cambridge University Press

χαλεπὸν γὰρ τὸ μετρίως εἰπεῖν, as glossed by the two following sentences.[22] The relative clause ἐν ᾧι μόλις καὶ ἡ δόκησις τῆς ἀληθείας βεβαιοῦται now explains, I suggest, how it is that, even if the speaker succeeds in the difficult task of striking the necessary balance, he risks damaging the reputation of the deceased: taking the antecedent of ᾧι to be τὸ μετρίως εἰπεῖν, I suggest that Pericles' point in the relative clause is that by such a speech – a speech embodying moderation – the impression (ἡ δόκησις) of the truth (τῆς ἀληθείας) about the deceased – the impression, that is to say, given by the other elements of the ceremony, the combined effect of which is one of splendour – is hardly (μόλις) likely to be confirmed (βεβαιοῦται). I take καὶ here to be one that 'emphasizes the fact that the relative clause contains an addition to the information contained in the main clause'.[23] 'The emphasis which καὶ gives to a relative clause can often be best brought out in English by the insertion of a new (pronominal) antecedent;'[24] so here one might translate, 'For it is difficult to make a speech that strikes the necessary balance; and that is something by which the [*sc.* magnificent] impression of the truth is scarcely confirmed'. For δόκησις (impression), *cf.* 2.84.1, of Phormio's ships manoeuvring against the enemy: δόκησιν παρέχοντες αὐτίκα ἐμβαλεῖν (leading the crews to suppose that they were on the point of charging); 3.43.1: Diodotus, speaking of the Athenians' unjustified suspicion of their politicians, refers to τῆς οὐ βεβαίου δοκήσεως τῶν κερδῶν (the – unconfirmed – notion of personal gain); and 4.126.4: Brasidas, addressing his Peloponnesian troops facing imminent attack by a numerically superior force of Illyrians, refers dismissively to ὅσα μὲν τῶι ὄντι ἀσθενῆ ὄντα τῶν πολεμίων δόκησιν ἔχει ἰσχύος (an enemy often has weak points which wear the appearance of strength).

The splendour of the ceremony[25] has been highlighted in Chapter 34; note in particular the *larnakes* of cypress wood (34.3)[26] and the description of the place of burial, the *demosion sema*, as being 'in the most beautiful spot outside the walls' (34.5), an aesthetic comment 'almost unique' in Thucydides.[27] In stating his reservations about the *logos* in 35.1, Pericles has contrasted honours given to the deceased which his audience can *see* (ὁρᾶτε)[28] with what is *said* (εἰπόντι; *cf.* ἀγορεύεσθαι in his opening sentence); and speaking and hearing feature prominently in 35.2 (εἰπεῖν, ἀκροατὴς, ἀκούοι, λεγόμενοι, ἤκουσεν). Its opening sentence notes, on the interpretation I propose, the tension between a speech that succeeds in hitting the required mean and the ceremony's great visual impact; a tension that may well raise doubts about the achievements of the deceased – far better, in Pericles' view, to let well alone.[29] Underlying Pericles' argument is, I take it, the familiar contrast between seeing and hearing as sources of information.[30]

Disparity between *logos* and *ergon* features in the introductions of other funeral speeches, where, however, the problem is the standard one of the speaker's inadequacy in relation to the immensity of his subject-matter;[31] for Pericles, the problem lies rather in the inadequacy of one element among those he is addressing (note in particular εἴ τι ὑπὲρ τὴν αὐτοῦ φύσιν ἀκούοι (if he should hear something beyond his own capacity), 35.2).

[22] Note ἀπιστοῦσιν at the end of the second of these sentences, picking up πιστευθῆναι at the end of 35.1.

[23] Denniston (1954) 294.

[24] Denniston (1954) 295.

[25] *Cf.* Socrates' justification of his view that death in battle is a fine thing for an Athenian: 'he is given a noble and magnificent funeral, even if he died a poor man' (Pl. *Menex.* 234c2–3).

[26] *Cf.* Meiggs (1982) 292–94.

[27] The phrase is Hornblower's.

[28] The opening chapter's only verb in the second person.

[29] *Cf.* Demosthenes' assertion in his speech *On the Navy Boards* that previous orators' praise of the great deeds of Athens' past has actually lowered the esteem in which their audiences held them (14.1); and his acknowledgement in his speech *Against Leptines* that to give an account of Chabrias' achievements may in fact diminish the respect in which Chabrias' memory is held by his audience (20.76).

[30] *Cf.* Marincola (1997) 63–86.

[31] Lys. 2.1; Dem. 60.1; Hyp. 6.1–2; *cf.* Pl. *Menex.* 235d.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426910000753 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As we noted, in beginning his speech Pericles deploys a standard rhetorical formula; and the paradoxical argument of his opening chapter recalls other texts that 'are the result of the rhetorical training of men like Protagoras, who taught that there were two arguments on every subject'.[32] In a particularly striking defence of the weaker argument, rhetoric is here turned against itself:[33] *logos* is not merely unnecessary, it is pernicious. Pericles ends the chapter by acknowledging that, nonetheless, speak he must; and the speech proper now begins.[34]

The most obvious way in which Pericles deals with the problem he has stated at the outset is by making the focus of the main body of his speech not the deceased but rather the *polis* in whose service they died. An introductory chapter that pays tribute to earlier generations of Athenians (36) leads on to what is by far the longest section of the speech, an analysis of what makes contemporary Athens the unique phenomenon she is (37–41); then comes Pericles' eulogy of the deceased (42); this is followed by his exhortation of their comrades (43) and his address to the bereaved (44–45). A short epilogue (46) concludes the speech.

In addressing the bereaved, Pericles turns first to the parents of the deceased (44), then to their sons and brothers (45.1) and finally to their widows (45.2). The first group, which receives twice as much attention as the two latter groups together, is divided into two categories: those who are still of an age to make good their, and the city's, loss (44.3) and those too old to be able to do this (44.4). To the latter Pericles offers twofold consolation: first, they have enjoyed good fortune for the greater part of their lives and will not have to endure its loss for long; secondly, their grief will be lightened by their enjoyment of the honour brought to them by the *eukleia* of the deceased. Pericles continues (45.1):

> To you who are the sons and brothers of the departed, I see that the struggle to emulate them will be an arduous one. For all men praise the dead, and, however pre-eminent your virtue may be, hardly will you be thought, I do not say to equal, but even to approach them. The living have their rivals and detractors, but when a man is out of the way, the honour and goodwill which he receives is unalloyed.

As commentators have noted, Pericles' comment here recalls the explanation he has given in Chapter 35 of the difficulty a funeral speech presents:

> The friend of the dead who knows the facts is likely to think that the words of the speaker fall short of his knowledge and of his wishes; another who is not so well informed, when he hears of anything which surpasses his own powers, will be envious and will suspect exaggeration. Mankind is tolerant of the praises of others so long as each hearer thinks that he can do as well or nearly as well himself, but, when the speaker rises above him, jealousy is aroused and he begins to be incredulous (35.2).

Some[35] see a contradiction between the two passages: in 35.2 some in the audience find praise of the deceased intolerable when it is of deeds beyond their own capacity; according to 45.1, everyone praises the deceased. Rather, it seems to me, the passages are complementary: 35.2 concerns what people *hear*, 45.1 what people *say*. However that may be, it seems at any rate unlikely that Pericles does not here intend his audience to recall the opening chapter of his speech.

[32] Bond on Eur. *Heracl.* 151–64, Lycus' 'epideixis on the theme "Heracles was not brave"'.

[33] The connection between ἔργωι and παρασκευασθέντα in the second sentence of 35.1 I take to point a contrast with the sort of *paraskeuai* that its critics alleged *logos* deployed.

[34] The transition I take to be marked by the opening word of Chapter 36: Ἄρξομαι (I shall begin): Chapter 35 has featured no verb in the first-person singular.

[35] For example, Rusten.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426910000753 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This brings us to Pericles' address to the widows of the deceased, the final element of the main body of the speech (45.2):

> εἰ δέ με δεῖ καὶ γυναικείας τι ἀρετῆς, ὅσαι νῦν ἐν χηρείαι ἔσονται, μνησθῆναι, βραχείαι παραινέσει ἅπαν σημανῶ. τῆς τε γὰρ ὑπαρχούσης φύσεως μὴ χείροσι γενέσθαι ὑμῖν μεγάλη ἡ δόξα καὶ ἧς ἂν ἐπ' ἐλάχιστον ἀρετῆς πέρι ἢ ψόγου ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος ᾖ.

The very considerable amount of attention this passage has attracted, particularly in recent decades, has produced little in the way of consensus – unless it be the belief that here Pericles (or Thucydides) has nodded.[36] Possibly so; but given Pericles' transcendent gifts as an orator,[37] and Thucydides' praise of these,[38] it seems worth considering whether a less negative view of the passage may not be available.

The notion that Pericles addresses the widows only because the conventions of the funeral speech oblige him to at any rate finds no support in other funeral speeches;[39] and consideration of some parallels to his opening words in this passage suggests a quite contrary interpretation.

(i) At the end of a long defence of rhetoric in the *Nicocles*, Isocrates writes (*Nicocles* 9): εἰ δὲ δεῖ συλλήβδην περὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ταύτης εἰπεῖν ... (εἰ δὲ δεῖ to give a brief summary of this faculty…).[40]

(ii) Arguing that monarchy is the best *politeia*, Nicocles points out (*Nicocles* 26) that experience shows this to be the case; he continues: εἰ δὲ δεῖ τι καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων εἰπεῖν, λέγεται καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ὑπὸ Διὸς βασιλεύεσθαι (εἰ δὲ δεῖ to speak too about matters from of old, it is said that even the gods have Zeus as their king).

(iii) Urging his fellow-citizens to put their house in order if they wish to succeed against Philip, Demosthenes asks (2.28): τίνος γὰρ ἕνεκ', ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, νομίζετε τοῦτον μὲν φεύγειν τὸν πόλεμον πάντας ὅσους ἂν ἐκπέμψητε στρατηγούς, ἰδίους δ' εὑρίσκειν πολέμους, εἰ δεῖ τι τῶν ὄντων καὶ περὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν εἰπεῖν; (Why is it, Athenians, do you think, that all the generals you despatch shun this war and find wars of their own to fight – εἰ δεῖ to speak something of the truth about them?).

(iv) Having criticized Aeschines for unfairly contrasting him with the great men of Athens' past, Demosthenes suggests (18.317) that as a matter of fact he and they do have something in common – a commitment to advancing Athens' interests: καὶ μὴν εἰ καὶ τοῦτ' ἄρα δεῖ μ' εἰπεῖν, ἡ μὲν ἐμὴ πολιτεία καὶ προαίρεσις, ἄν τις σκοπῇ, ταῖς τῶν τότ' ἐπαινουμένων ἀνδρῶν ὁμοία καὶ ταὐτὰ βουλομένη φανήσεται... (Yet, εἰ καὶ τοῦτ' ἄρα δεῖ μ' εἰπεῖν, *my* policy and programme will on inspection prove to be similar in character and aim to those of the men who were praised then …).[41]

(v) Having remarked that, given the sort of people they are, the lack of public honours among the Thebans is in no way surprising, Demosthenes continues (20.109): μήτ' οὖν ἐκεῖνοί ποτε παύσαιντο, εἰ ἄρ' εὔξασθαι δεῖ, τοὺς μὲν αὐτοὺς ἀγαθόν τι ποιοῦντας μήτε τιμῶντες μήτε θαυμάζοντες... (May they never cease, εἰ ἄρ' εὔξασθαι δεῖ, from failing to honour and admire their benefactors…).

[36] For example, Gomme: 'his explanation of the whole matter is not only brief and priggish, but advice, not consolation, and advice that is most of it not called for by the occasion'; *cf.* Rusten and Fantasia.

[37] *Cf.* Connor (1962).

[38] 1.139.4; 2.65.8–9.

[39] Lysias (2.71, 2.75) and Plato (*Menex.* 248c5–8) briefly refer to the widows of the deceased, who are not however addressed directly (the reference in the *Menexenus* occurs in the deceaseds' address to their parents).

[40] = Isoc. *Antid.* 257.

[41] With Demosthenes' preceding point about the unfairness of comparing the living and the dead, *cf.* Pericles' comment in 45.1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426910000753 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(vi) Having given an account of the wealthy Meidias' mistreatment of him, Demosthenes comments (21.112): εἰ γὰρ εἰπεῖν τι καὶ περὶ τούτων ἤδη δεῖ, οὐ μέτεστι τῶν ἴσων οὐδὲ τῶν ὁμοίων, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, πρὸς τοὺς πλουσίους τοῖς λοιποῖς ἡμῶν, οὐ μέτεστι, οὔ (εἰ γὰρ εἰπεῖν τι καὶ περὶ τούτων ἤδη δεῖ, against the rich, Athenians, the rest of us have no share in equality or fairness, no share) – and goes on to develop the point.

(vii) Speaking of the Athenian dead at Chaeronea, Lycurgus says (49): εἰ δὲ δεῖ τι καὶ παραδοξότατον μὲν εἰπεῖν, ἀληθὲς δέ, ἐκεῖνοι νικῶντες ἀπέθανον (εἰ δὲ δεῖ to say something most paradoxical, yet true, of those men, in dying they conquered).

In all these passages[42] the speaker is it seems asking those he is addressing to countenance his saying something he recognizes they might otherwise, for whatever reason, take exception to: εἰ ... δεῖ meaning 'if one is to', with the force not of 'if one must' but of 'if one may'; the words are 'apologetic in tone'.[43] We noted that Pericles uses a rhetorical formula in beginning the Funeral Speech; I suggest that he is using another rhetorical formula in introducing the final element of the main body of that speech. The one he deploys at 35.1 relates to the main topic of the Funeral Speech, the *arete* of the deceased – a matter which, as he goes on to emphasize, he believes it preferable *not* to make the subject of a speech; Pericles will deliver his speech only because the *nomos* obliges him to (35.3). The deceased are – of course – men (ἀνδρῶν, 35.1); the speech praising them is, as presented in 35.1, something added on to the funeral ceremony it concludes. At 45.2, in concluding his speech, Pericles adds to what the *nomos* has required of him – celebration of the *arete* of men – something that he himself chooses to include, a topic his opening words acknowledge might in this context be considered inappropriate: reference to the *arete* of women. At 35.2 Pericles has emphasized how difficult it is to strike the necessary balance when speaking of the *aretai* of the deceased; at 45.2 he remarks that in relation to their widows he will express the whole matter in a brief *parainesis*.

The term *parainesis* here is generally taken to mean 'admonition';[44] Pericles is taking it upon himself to tell the widows how they should conduct themselves.

At 8.76 Thucydides reports the reaction of the Athenian troops at Samos to the news of the oligarchic coup at Athens in 411. Initial fury gave way to considered measures designed to ensure unity against both the Peloponnesian enemy and the oligarchs at Athens; met in assembly, the Athenians deposed their existing commanders and appointed replacements (8.76.1–2). Next, Thucydides reports, a series of speakers put forward various *paraineseis*, arguing, *inter alia*, that they should not be discouraged by the city's defection: on the contrary, in terms of numbers and resources the advantage lay with them (8.76.3). There follows a long passage, still in reported speech, developing the point that the Athenians at Samos were in a far stronger position than might be supposed (8.76.4–7). Thucydides concludes his report as follows: 'Having met and encouraged one another by these and similar appeals, they displayed a corresponding energy in their preparations for war' (8.77).

The word *parainesis* at 76.3 is hardly to be translated 'admonition'; what the Athenians were doing was offering one another encouragement. They had indeed been deprived of the city itself, but that was no reason to lose heart, as a whole range of considerations show. There is an obvious parallel between the situation of Athenians at Samos and that of the widows of the Funeral Speech: the former have been deprived of the city of Athens, the latter have lost their husbands. Possibly, then, the term *parainesis* has the same meaning in both passages.

[42] For further instances, *cf.* Wankel on Demosthenes 18.159, who cites Gebauer's very full discussion (Gebauer 258–69, especially 260–63).

[43] Petrie on item (vii) above, Lyc. 49. *Cf.* Old Oligarch 2.7: εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ σμικροτέρων μνησθῆναι..., a particularly close parallel to our instance; the closest parallel I know of is presumably a deliberate echo, Lucian *Hist. conscr.* 17: εἰ δέ με δεῖ καὶ σοφοῦ ἀνδρὸς μνησθῆναι...

[44] So, for example, Rusten. It is a standard term, in Thucydides and elsewhere, for exhortation before battle (for example, 2.88.1, 4.95.1, 5.69.1, 2; *cf.* Pritchett (1994) 39).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426910000753 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This brings us to the heart of the matter: what is the content of Pericles' *parainesis*? What does the concluding sentence of 45.2 mean?

Pericles begins: τῆς τε γὰρ ὑπαρχούσης φύσεως μὴ χείροσι γενέσθαι ὑμῖν μεγάλη ἡ δόξα. He offers no elucidation; the obvious explanation being that he considers none necessary. What, for ancient Greeks, made a woman less than a woman? Failure to marry.[45] Pericles has presented male *arete* as a matter of measuring up to the demands of the *polis*;[46] here, I suggest, he is making the point that female *arete* is, by contrast, a matter of proving oneself adequate to the standard set by nature[47] – and this, by definition, the widows have achieved. Pericles is offering, not admonition, but consolation: 'To be not inferior to the nature that is yours[48] is a great glory to you'.

Pericles continues: καὶ ἧς ἂν ἐπ' ἐλάχιστον ἀρετῆς πέρι ἢ ψόγου ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος ἦι. Here too, Pericles offers no gloss: what obvious point might he be making? Pericles has eschewed substantial reference to what is a major element in other funeral speeches, Athens' noble deeds in the heroic age.[49] He has, in his analysis of Athenian military prowess in Chapter 39, used contemporary Sparta as a foil. Here, one notes the move from plural (ὑμῖν) to singular (ῆς), and the emphatic position of ἐπ' ἐλάχιστον. There can be no doubt as to who, among Greek women, possessed the greatest *kleos* for *arete* or censure among Greek men: Helen.[50] Pericles, I suggest, here implicitly offers her as a model of all that a woman ought *not* to be: the widows – *Athenian* women as they are[51] – will have been brought up to conduct themselves in exemplary fashion, and (I take him to be encouragingly intimating) can be relied upon to do so in their widowhood, thus maintaining the great glory they already enjoy.

I propose the following translation of 45.2:

> And, if I may make some mention also of womanly excellence, with reference to those who will now be in widowhood, a brief word of encouragement will encompass everything: to be not inferior to the nature that is yours is a great glory to you; and great glory is hers of whom there is least report, for excellence or censure, among the opposite sex.

Pericles has argued at the beginning of the Funeral Speech that the glory of the deceased is prejudiced by their being spoken of on the occasion of their public burial; he brings his speech to a close by reminding their widows that a woman's glory is prejudiced by her being publicly spoken of on any occasion.

Although Pericles has finished his speech, he still has one final point to add (46.1):

> Εἴρηται καὶ ἐμοὶ λόγωι κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὅσα εἶχον πρόσφορα, καὶ ἔργωι οἱ θαπτόμενοι τὰ μὲν ἤδη κεκόσμηνται, τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν τοὺς παῖδας τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε δημοσίαι ἡ πόλις μέχρι ἥβης θρέψει, ὠφέλιμον στέφανον τοῖσδε καὶ τοῖς λειπομένοις τῶν τοιῶνδε ἀγώνων προτιθεῖσα· ἆθλα γὰρ οἷς κεῖται ἀρετῆς μέγιστα, τοῖς δὲ καὶ ἄνδρες ἄριστοι πολιτεύουσιν.

[45] 'The time of her marriage was the fundamental turning-point in a Greek woman's life': Chadwick (1996) 227, in a discussion of the term *parthenos*.

[46] Note especially 43.1: Καὶ οἵδε μὲν προσηκόντως τῆι πόλει τοιοίδε ἐγένοντο (Such was the end of these men; they were worthy of Athens).

[47] Note the emphatic position of the phrase τῆς ... ὑπαρχούσης φύσεως.

[48] I.e. that belongs to you qua women; contrast the opening chapter's reference to the *phusis* of individual men (35.2).

[49] *Cf.* Ziolkowski (1981) 75.

[50] Thucydides mentions Helen by name at 1.9.1: his sole reference to a Spartan female. On Helen in Archaic and fifth-century Greece, see Allan 10–28.

[51] Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 26.4; for Sparta, *cf.*, for example, Eur. *Andr.* 595–96: 'Not even were she so inclined could a Spartan girl be chaste'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426910000753 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> I have paid the required tribute, in obedience to the law, making use of such fitting words as I had. The tribute of deeds has been paid in part; for the dead have been honourably interred, and it remains only that their children should be maintained at the public charge until they are grown up: this is the solid prize with which, as with a garland, Athens crowns her sons living and dead, after a struggle like theirs. For where the rewards of virtue are greatest, there the noblest citizens are enlisted in the service of the state.

It seems preferable to take the καὶ before ἐμοὶ as going with καὶ before ἔργωι,[52] rather than as meaning 'I too <like my predecessors>', as καὶ ἐμὲ in 35.3,[53] emphasizing a final instance of the *logos*/*ergon* contrast. But while 35.1 had implied that as far as *ergon* was concerned all had been completed, Pericles here contrasts the element of *ergon* relating to the funeral ceremony (οἱ θαπτόμενοι τὰ μὲν ἤδη κεκόσμηνται) with what is yet to come: τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν τοὺς παῖδας τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε δημοσίαι ἡ πόλις μέχρι ἥβης θρέψει, adding: ὠφέλιμον στέφανον τοῖσδε καὶ τοῖς λειπομένοις τῶν τοιῶνδε ἀγώνων προτιθεῖσα. Its position highlights the adjective ὠφέλιμον; I suggest that it points back to Pericles' argument in Chapter 35, and that the phrase ὠφέλιμον στέφανον contrasts the useful support of the orphans with the prejudicial 'crown' of the funeral speech.[54] If so, the variant προστιθεῖσα[55] rather than προτιθεῖσα commends itself, picking up προσθέντα in the opening sentence of the Funeral Speech.

Bibliography

Texts, etc.
Alberti, G.B. (1972) *Thucydidis Historiae Libri I-II* (Rome)
Allan, W. (2008) *Euripides: Helen* (Cambridge)
Bond, G.W. (1981) *Euripides: Heracles* (Oxford)
Classen, J. and Steup, J. (1966) *Thukydides* (7th edition, 8 vols) (Berlin)
de Sélincourt, A. (1996) *Herodotus: The Histories* (revised edition) (London)
Fantasia, U. (2003) *Tucidide: La Guerra del Peloponneso Libro II* (Pisa)
Gebauer, G. (1880) *Ausgewählte Reden des Lysias für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Hermann Frohberger, Vol. 1* (2nd edition) (Leipzig)
Goeller, F. (1836) *Thucydidis de Bello Peloponnesiaco Libri Octo* (2nd edition, 2 vols) (Leipzig)
Gomme, A.W. (1956) *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. II: Books II–III* (Oxford)
Haack, C.F.F. (1823) *Thucydidis de Bello Peloponnesiaco Libri Octo* (3 vols) (London)
Hornblower, S. (1991) *A Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. I: Books I–III* (Oxford)
How, W.W. and Wells, J. (1912) *A Commentary on Herodotus* (2 vols) (Oxford)
Jowett, B. (1881) *Thucydides* (2 vols) (Oxford)
Petrie, A. (1922) *Lycurgus: The Speech against Leocrates* (Cambridge)
Poppo, E.F. (1834) *Thucydidis de Bello Peloponnesiaco Libri Octo, Part III, Vol. II* (Leipzig)
Rhodes, P.J. (1981) *A Commentary on the Aristotelian* Athenaion Politeia (Oxford)
— (1988) *Thucydides: History II* (Warminster)
Rusten, J.S. (1989) *Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War Book II* (Cambridge)
Shilleto, R. (1880) *Thucydidis II* (Cambridge)
Wankel, H. (1976) *Demosthenes: Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz* (2 vols) (Heidelberg)

[52] So, for example, Classen and Steup.

[53] So, for example, Rusten.

[54] For *stephanos* used of praise, *cf.* Bond on Eur. *Heracl.* 355–58.

[55] The reading of the manuscripts that provide several readings in this chapter accepted by most modern editors: *cf.* Alberti's *apparatus criticus.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426910000753 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Books/articles
Chadwick, J. (1996) *Lexicographica Graeca: Contributions to the Lexicography of Ancient Greek* (Oxford)
Clairmont, C.W. (1983) *Patrios Nomos: Public Burial in Athens during the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC* (2 vols) (BAR International Series 161) (Oxford)
Connor, W.R. (1962) '*VIM QUANDAM INCREDIBILEM*: a tradition concerning the oratory of Pericles', *C&M* 23, 23–33
Denniston, J.D. (1954) *The Greek Particles* (2nd edition) (Oxford)
Fraenkel, E. (1961) 'Eine Anfangsformel attischer Reden', *Glotta* 39, 1–5
Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge)
Maurer, K. (1995) *Interpolation in Thucydides* (Mnemosyne Supplement 150) (Leiden)
Meiggs, R. (1982) *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Oxford)
Ostwald, M. (1969) *Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy* (Oxford)
Parker, R. (1996) *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford)
Parry, A.M. (1981) Logos *and* ergon *in Thucydides* (New York)
Pritchett, W.K. (1994) *Essays in Greek History* (Amsterdam)
Ziolkowski, J.E. (1981) *Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches at Athens* (New York)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426910000753 Published online by Cambridge University Press